

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges receipt of an Advisory Action dated September 8, 2004. In this response Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 18, and 19. In addition, claims 25-32 have been added. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification, *inter alia*, at paragraph [0034] and paragraph [0045] and in figures 1-4. Applicant notes that these amendments supplement and amend the claims as presented in Applicant's Amendment and Reply filed on August 17, 2004. Entry and consideration of the August 17, 2004 Amendment and Reply has been requested in the Request for Continued Examination being filed concurrently herewith.

Following entry of these amendments, claims 1-32 are pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks which follow.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102/103

On page 2 of the Office Action dated February 17, 2004, the PTO has rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,283,507 to Kami *et al.* (hereafter "Kami") in view of U.S. Patent 6,177,366 to Li *et al.* (hereafter "Li"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 18 and 19 to recite that the "second silicone interposed between the opposed sides of the first and second portions at a junction thereof" to clarify the location of the second adhesive.

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Amendment and Reply filed on August 17, 2004 (which are hereby incorporated by reference), Applicant notes that neither Kami nor Li, taken either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the presently claimed second silicone, which comprises "a solventless addition room-temperature-vulcanizing adhesive silicone" as recited in independent claims 1, 18 and 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that neither Kami nor Li can anticipate either claim 1 or 18. Applicant further submits that neither Kami nor Li, taken either individually or in combination, teaches or

suggests the presently claimed second silicone, which comprises “a solventless addition room-temperature-vulcanizing adhesive silicone” as recited in independent claims 1 and 18.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See MPEP 2143.03. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 2-17 and 19-25, which ultimately depend from either independent claim 1 or independent claim 18, are also non-obvious.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections under §102 and §103.

Newly Added Claims

In this response, Applicant has added claims 25-32.

With regard to claims 25 and 26, Applicant notes that neither Kami nor Li, taken either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests, “a second silicone resin interposed between opposite sides of the first and second portions at a junction thereof” wherein “the junction is located at an outer periphery of the first and second portions.”

With regard to claim 27, Applicant notes that neither Kami nor Li, taken either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests, “a second silicone resin interposed between opposite sides of the first and second portions at a junction thereof” wherein “the first silicone is placed both on both of the opposed sides.”

With regard to claim 28, Applicant notes that neither Kami nor Li, taken either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests “a second silicone resin interposed between opposite sides of the first and second portions at a junction thereof” wherein “the first silicone is placed on both of the opposed sides at the junction.”

With regard to claims 29 and 31, Applicant notes that neither Kami nor Li, taken either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests an airbag “wherein the opposed sides of the first and second portions of the main body of the airbag both comprise the first silicone at a junction and wherein the second silicone is interposed between the first and second portions at the junction.”


With regard to claims 30 and 32, Applicant notes that neither Kami nor Li, taken either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests an airbag “wherein the second silicone is selectively applied at the junction.”

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. An early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/17/04
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5540
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 
Richard L. Schwaab
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,479

Paul D. Strain
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,369